

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the Office Action dated November 16, 2005, the Advisory Action of February 24, 2006, and the telephone interview of March 7, 2006. For the following reasons this amendment should be entered, the application allowed, and the case passed to issue. No new matter or considerations are introduced by this amendment. Support for the amendment to claims 10, 21, and 23 is found throughout the specification including the Figures which clearly illustrate that the isolation region 18 is between the first and second regions. The Examiner has previously considered the amendment and requested that Applicant submit the amendment in a filed response. The amendment overcomes an indefiniteness rejection and clearly places the application in condition for allowance.

Claims 10-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1-9 have been canceled. Claims 10-27 are rejected. Claims 10, 21, and 23 have been amended in this response.

Interview Summary

Applicant greatly appreciates Examiner Crane's courtesy of granting a telephone interview with the undersigned on March 7, 2006. During the interview, the undersigned proposed an amendment to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and place the application in condition for allowance. Examiner Crane requested that the undersigned FAX the proposed amendment to her attention, which the undersigned did. On March 8, 2006, Examiner Crane called the undersigned, reported that the proposed amendment would overcome the rejection, and requested that the proposed amendment be filed in a response.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 10-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This Examiner alleged that "interposed isolation regions" is not clear. This rejection is traversed, and reconsideration and withdrawal thereof respectfully requested.

In the Advisory Action mailed February 24, 2006, the Examiner invited the Applicant to submit an amendment to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant thanks the Examiner for suggesting that Applicant present an amendment to correct the asserted informality. In response to the Advisory Action, the undersigned called Examiner Crane on March 7, 2006 to propose an amendment. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment would overcome the rejection and requested that the amendment be filed in a response. The proposed amendment is presented in this response. Thus, Applicant submits that the application is clearly in condition for allowance.

As is clear from the instant claims, written description, and drawings, "interposed isolation regions," as recited in claims 10, 21, and 23 prior to the present amendment means that the isolation regions are between the first regions and the second regions. Thus, the present invention clarifies the claims and does not narrow the scope of the claims.

Therefore, in light of the above Amendments and Remarks, this Amendment should be entered, the application allowed, and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding these remarks or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper,

10/620,605

including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Bernard P. Codd
Registration No. 46,429

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 BPC:MWE
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: March 10, 2006

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**